1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

PREFACE

[22]
121

THE investigation of which this book is a record was made with the assistance of a Leverhulme Fellowship for the years 1937 and 1938. As the work was carried out alone, and in a field hitherto neglected by ethnologists, I am conscious that there must be many omissions and oversights in this survey of the Min Chia culture as it is to-day. The language barrier was certainly not wholly surmounted, for while I cannot claim to have learned to speak Min Chia with real fluency, the Min Chia of the less educated class do not speak Chinese without difficulty and cannot express all their thought in that language. The vocabulary printed as an appendix will no doubt reveal the effects of these difficulties, and the system of romanisation adopted for Min Chia, being based on English and not on the Wade system used for Chinese, may not meet with the approval of all readers. My justification for this must be that I have endeavoured to render Min Chia pronunciation as it is sounded, and that the vocabulary was made primarily for my own use when learning the language. I can only hope that this first attempt to record the Min Chia language and its grammar may prove of some interest to specialists.

OOO While in Yunnan I received at all times the assistance and hospitality of the missionaries of the China Inland Mission, and I wish especially to acknowledge my debt to Mr. and Mrs. W. Allen, Mr. H. Owen and Mr. E. Holmes, of the C.I.M. in Ta Li. I also had the advantage of consulting the late Mr. Fraser of this Mission, whose knowledge of the peoples of Yunnan, and especially the Li Su, was unrivalled.

The debt of pupil to teacher, so well understood in China, is due to Professor B. Malinowski, under whom I studied anthropology before venturing into the field.

[p. vii] [pp. iv, v, vi, are blank]

2:T'ao--1 E-5 (no date) 1945 AE3 Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

Some Creation Stories

Told by Tribal Peoples of The Tibetan-Burmese Group in Yunnan

By T'ao Yün-k'uei

The following is a record of sixteen stories about the origin of /2/ mankind, elves, insects and fishes, rice and grains, tobacco and wines. These were written down as told by the natives in the borderland of Yunnan in the year 1936 when an investigation was made of the tribal peoples there. (See map of the distribution of aborigines in Yunnan, Page 2.)

Myths and stories, in a simple society, are not merely after dinner talks or subject matters for pastime, but they are recognized as things which actually took place in the past. They look upon the myths in the same way the Chinese believe in the Golden Era of San-huang-wu-ti (three monarchs and five emperors). Their myths live in their everyday life; and thus, from myths, it is not difficult for us to have a glimpse of their mass beliefs, morals and the principles of conformity in social behaviors. In these myths, there are many intricate scenes, winding perspectives, attractive descriptions, numerous love affairs and adventures. And this is no less the reason that it has become one of the indispensable subject matter of pastime for the monotonous living in simple societies. Even we, upon hearing these tales, would feel their vivid persuasiveness, and be thus enlivened by them. From the viewpoint of comparative anthropology, to study the problems of cultural propagation, evolution, and the near and distant relations among various racial groups, myths are also a paramount object for research. Owing to the lack of comparative data, this essay will be limited to a narration of the original tales to serve as a reference for future study.

/3/

I. Moso (who call themselves Nashi)

1. Li-chiang hsien

In the distant ancient time, the Deluge had become calamities 773 which drowned out all mankind. The only survival was a man by 539 the name Zungtzerliri, who, by hiding himself in a drum, narrowly escaped. As the Deluge gradually rose, the drum ascended with it. When the roars of the water had ceased, he broke out from the drum

23:Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 ALl Southeast Asia ALl
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

17. Review of Tibeto-Burman

SA
121
601
ST
121
601

The present section has been written with a two-fold view in mind, viz. a provisional reconstruction of the archaic Tibeto-Burman kinship nomenclature and a synthesis of material bearing on the general problem of the factors that have produced changes in this archaic system. It is of course impossible to realize either of these goals in any complete sense. The reconstruction of a set of kinship terms differs very little from the reconstruction of any other group of terms, e.g. those for animals. In each case certain phonetic generalizations must be followed, and in each case original meanings must be assigned to roots on the basis of a series of fluctuating connotations. The difficult problem of "partial equations", in which a given root has a limited distribution, arises here precisely as in any other linguistic field (for a good recent discussion, vide Scherer, 1941). A distinction between the two types of reconstruction can be drawn, however, in the fact that kinship terms constitute a definite system whereas those for animals, parts of the body, or the like, do not constitute such a system. It is fairly evident that, within kinship nomenclature, a semantic shift at one point is likely to be reflected at another, or, in sociological terms, a single factor, e.g. cross-cousin marriage, is likely to produce a series of interrelated changes, whereas this in general does not hold true within other linguistic spheres. In this respect a kinship nomenclature might be compared with

SA 121 601 ST 121 601

a phonemic system, in which similar integration appears. The point is not worth elaborating, since the fact that a kinship terminology does constitute a system hardly relieves us of the task of investigating each element of that system, both independently and correlatively.

In any piece of historical reconstruction, linguistic or other, the natural tendency is to make the prototype unduly complex. The writer has often been struck by the complexities shown by hypothetical reconstructed languages as compared with their actual living descendants, as though linguistic evolution always proceeded in the direction of simplification. The number of distinct roots assigned to these reconstructed languages is sometimes of staggering magnitude, and no ingenuity is spared in augmenting this lexicographical harvest. In the present study it would be easy to reconstruct an archaic nomenclature with two or more terms for most relationships, yet such a procedure patently would be futile. It is far better to determine, firstly, which elements are relatively certain, and, secondly, which elements [illegible] based largely on "pa[illegible]al equations" and must thus be [illegible] reserve until a basic framework has been set up. [illegible]oots, eight of which are applied to consanguineal relatives, stand out in our complete Tibeto-Burman series as culled from the foregoing review. These roots constitute the following systems

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

SA 601 ST 601 group with xC marriage and a type of bachelor's house with their immediate neighbors, the Tibetans, who practise polyandry rather than xC marriage (traces of the latter persist) and have nothing suggesting a bachelor's house. The same type of contrast is presented by the primitive Arakanese with xC marriage and premarital sexual freedom (Hutchinson, p. 113) and the sophisticated Burmese, who lack xC marriage and whose courtship pattern had become highly formalized even in medieval times (vide the interesting account by Kin). It is not suggested that xC marriage and premarital sexual laxity are necessarily correlated in any way, but, in the area under consideration, both appear to belong to the same general cultural stratum.

****

SA [121] ST [121] The present study is of limited scope and comparative material has therefore been eliminated. The parallelism between the Kuki Omaha pattern and that found among the BaThonga and Nama Hottentot of South Africa, however, is too attractive to be omitted. The Nama Hottentot (Schapera, pp. 230 and ff.) employ the terms //náob gF,MB; //náos gM,MBW (but MB is now called omeb < Dutch oom "uncle", and MBW is now called mugis < Dutch mookie "little mother"); //núrib xCe,SiS(ms),gS; //núris xCi,SiD(ms),gD. This system can be converted into the Kuki type by limiting //núrib and //núris to FSiCh and applying //náob and //náos to MBCh. Schapera describes xC marriage of bilateral type, but notes that among

23:Benedict E-5 (no date)1941 ALl Southeast Asia
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3
Karen AP7

SECTION B

KAREN AND CHINESE

1. Introduction

ST
197
[12]
K.
197
[12]

Having completed a review of the Tibeto-Burman kinship terminologies, the writer now proposes to discuss in summary fashion the salient points of the Karen and Chinese nomenclatures. Karen and Tibeto-Burman together constitute the western branch of the Sino-Tibetan stock, the eastern branch of which is represented by Chinese (Sinitic) and the Sinitic element in Thai. The term "Indo-Chinese" has been employed in a somewhat broader sense to include Thai itself, and the latter family is commonly coupled with Chinese in contrast to Tibeto-Burman. This view has been developed in a masterly study by Wulff and is shared by Maspero, a pioneer in Thai linguistics. The writer himself was originally partial toward this view, but more intensive investigations of the Thai languages have led to the conviction that a wholly distinct substratum is involved here, and that the Sinitic elements constitute little more than a veneer, albeit an ancient one. A rapprochement with Indonesian has been initiated, largely on the basis of a newly discovered linguistic group in southern China, northern Tonkin, and the island of Hainan. This newly recognized group, consisting of Kelao (southern China), Laqua (northern Tonkin), and Dai or Loi (Hainan), has been named "Kadai". Kadai is notable for its retention

3. Chinese

121
601

In the present section the writer proposes to examine the Chinese system of nomenclature with reference to the basic Tibeto-Burman system reconstructed above. Our interest naturally lies in the early Chinese system rather than in the later developments, for it is here that significant points of resemblance can be expected to appear. We shall devote our attention, therefore, to "Ancient Chinese" rather than to "Chinese" in general.

Our analysis has been made possible by the definitive work by Feng, to whom the anthropological world owes a lasting debt of gratitude. Just how great a debt this is can be realized only after a comparison has been made with the early crude account by Morgan (based on material supplied by Hart, an English customs official), the not-so-early but equally inadequate description by Hu, and even the more recent work by Chen and Shryock, which suffers from a grievous want of historical perspective. Feng has provided us with a detailed account of Chinese kinship nomenclature from the earliest period down to the present, based on carefully checked sources which are handled in the competent manner seldom attained even by our foremost European sinologues. A fair proportion of illustrative material is incorporated, and Chinese characters are cited. It is from this excellent source that the writer has drawn most of the material cited in this study.

121
601

Feng's work is incomplete only with respect to the modern dialects of China. Dialectical vocative terms are cited, and the developments behind some of the modern terms [redacted] brought to light, but the treatment is essentially [redacted]rary throughout. For the modern dialects as such we must turn to isolated descriptions of individual dialectical patterns, e.g. May's account of Cantonese nomenclature. The single exception here is furnished by Fei's analysis of the kinship terms employed in the dialects of Wukiang (Kiangsu), Shanghai, Hangchow (Chekiang), Tungchow (Hopei), Quemoy (Fukien), and Lanchow (Kansu), representing three major dialectical groups (Mandarin, Shanghai, Fukien). Fei devotes most of his attention to the vocative terms, which he regards as "more directly connected with the social organization" (p. 128).

From the present point of view, the main defect in Feng's work lies in the almost entire absence of linguistic treatment. Feng refers to his own method of approach as "primarily historical and linguistic" (p. 147), but from his footnote to this page we can see that he employs the term 'linguistic' in a greatly generalized sense. A truly linguistic approach calls for the use of archaic forms rather than of the phonetically degenerate Mandarin forms of the present day, and for an attempt, at least, to point out the affinities of these terms, both within and without Chinese. The employment of archaic forms, even in a

121 normalized orthography, would have removed the confusion
601 produced by (modern) homonyms such as fu < b'iu (父) F,
fu < piu (夫) M, fu < b'i u (婦) SM; cf. Bruster's
uncertainty on this point in his analysis of the material
presented by Chau and Shryock (p. 258).

601 The writer has attempted to supply the linguistic
[121] treatment lacking in Feng's work. The forms cited are those
of Ancient Chinese, as reconstructed for approximately A. D.
600. The still earlier Archaic Chinese language of the first
millenium B. C. has also been reconstructed in part, but our
authorities in this field (notably Karlgren, Simon, Li Fang-
kuei, and Chou Yao-fu) disagree on many important points.
The problems of a purely linguistic nature in this connection
are manifold and cannot be entered upon in the present review,
though occasional points are discussed below. The Ancient
Chinese forms cited are slightly normalized variants of those
found in Karlgren's well known Analytic Dictionary. In
Karlgren's orthography, adopted here in the interest of uni-
formity, ɐ represents the vowel of Eng. 'but', and a the
vowel of Eng. 'all'.

The ancient system of nomenclature is that recorded in
the Êrh Ya and the early ritual works (Li Chi), supplemented
by occasional gleanings from other classical works such as the
Tso Chuan and Shuo-wen. Our data on this ancient system are
not complete, but enough of it is known to provide a good
basis for discussion. In the tabulation below only the more
significant terms are included. Modern Mandarin forms are
cited within parentheses.